

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 34 are pending.

In response to August 16, 2007 Restriction Requirement, applicants elect, with traverse, for continued prosecution of Group IV claims (claims 1 – 5, 6, 9, 13 – 14, 17 – 22, 25, 28 - 30) which are drawn to a printer, classified in class 347, subclass 3, and directed to the print client indicator being a text attribute.

The applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the Wednesday, September 19, 2007 interview. In the interview, the applicants stated that claims 1, 9, 15 and 28 are generic claims to inventions I, II, III, IV, V and VI. The Examiner's listing of the claims 1, 9, 15, and 28 in each of the inventions I, II, III, IV, V and VI proves that the claims are generic claims and the Examiner appeared to agree to such in the interview.

Once a generic claim is allowable, all of the claims drawn to species in addition to the elected species which require all the limitations of the generic claim will ordinarily be allowable over the prior art in view of the allowability of the generic claim, since the additional species will depend thereon or otherwise require all of the limitations thereof.

MPEP 806.04(d). Therefore, if one of the generic claims is allowed, the claims in the non-elected inventions, that are dependent on the generic claim, may be added back to the present application.

The applicants also disagree with the Examiner in regard to inventions I – VII being related as a combination (invention VII – claims 32 - 34) and subcombination (I – VI). The Examiner states that the combination as claimed does not require that the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability and compares claim 17 to claim 32. The applicants respectfully disagree. The combination, invention VII (i.e.,

claims 32 or 34) does require the particulars of the subcombination, e.g., claims 17 or 28. The Examiner can compare the limitations of claims 32 and 34 to claims 17 and 28 and see that the patentability of claims 32 and 34 requires the particulars of claims 17 and 28. Specifically, the only limitations of claims 32 and 34 that are different than the limitations for claims 17 and 28 are directed to a plurality of computing device and a plurality of medical imaging devices. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the restriction based on the combination / subcombination be withdrawn. The applicants also submit that claims 32 and 34 are generic claims and should be listed with each of inventions I to VI. Applicants respectfully request correction by the Examiner.

An action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: September 25, 2007

By:


Mark R. Kendrick
Registration No. 48,468
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033